

REMARKS

Applicants hereby affirm election of Group III, claims 9-13, with traverse as stated during a phone conversation with the Examiner on May 11, 2006.

35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 10-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 10-13 have been amended to be consistent with the preamble of claim 9 and eliminating the basis for the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 9 through 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Fritze (US 3,662,335). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons. The Fritze reference fails in total in teaching or suggesting the claimed method for forming a tire having an annular antenna assembly affixed to an inward surface. The structure of Fritze is not formed by the claimed steps and is assembled to a tire in an entirely different manner. As a result, the tire of Fritze does not meet the claim limitations of claims 9-13. Specifically, the claimed tire (claim 9) is formed by forming within a rigid core defining an interior surface of the tire a core recess complementarily configured to an antenna assembly. Nowhere in the Fritze tire is there an antenna that is configured in complement to a tire core recess. Thus, the Fritze antenna assembly fails to meet the limitation of claim 9 as having a configuration which does not meet the recitation of that claim.

In addition (claim 9), the subject tire has an antenna assembly that comprises an inward peripheral boundary that is configured to conform with the tire core recess and an outward peripheral boundary. Nowhere in the Fritze tire is there an antenna assembly that is so configured. Specifically, the Fritze tire antenna assembly does not have an inward peripheral boundary configured to conform with a tire core recess. No teaching in Fritze can be construed as such a teaching.

Continuing, claim 9 recites a tire in which the antenna assembly outward boundary is cross-bonded to the inner surface of a tire during a cure cycle; and a tire in which an outward antenna assembly boundary remains unbonded and faces an inner cavity of the tire. The Fritze tire antenna assembly does not have an antenna assembly in which an outer boundary of the assembly is cross-bonded to an inner surface of a tire during a cure cycle while an

outward antenna assembly boundary remains unbonded and faces an inner cavity of a tire. It is noted in Fritz Figs. 2 and 3 that the antenna assembly 20 is embedded within a sidewall of Fritz. See Fritz column 4 lines 4-7, in which states referencing the coupling element 20 that the embodiment of FIG. 3 differs from the embodiment of FIG. 2 in that the antenna assembly 20 is directly in the tube 24 in FIG. 3 rather than in the bead-like band 25 of FIG. 2 (emphasis added). Thus, Fritz teaches an embedding of the antenna assembly 20 in sundry tire components and not, as set forth in claims 9-13 of the invention, a tire having an antenna assembly that is cross-bonded at an outer boundary to a tire wall and having an inner boundary that remains unbonded and faces a tire cavity. Fritz teaches a tire conventionally formed to encompass the placement of a sensing element 20 within a tire component and the placement of that tire component on a drum as part of a conventional tire build. Thus, the method of manufacture of the Fritz tire is different, resulting in a tire that is structurally different. The Fritz component 20, being entirely encapsulated into one tire component or another, accordingly cannot be deemed to be bonded at an outer boundary to an inner tire wall while an outward antenna assembly boundary remains unbonded and facing an inner cavity of a tire.

The present invention, to the contrary, teaches a tire that is formed by a process that cross-bonds an inner boundary of an antenna assembly boundary to a tire wall while leaving an outer boundary of the antenna assembly unbonded and facing the tire cavity.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the Fritz tire does not anticipate the claimed tire. In fact, the Fritz tire formed by conventional processes that does not achieve the advantages and manufacturing efficiencies of the claimed invention and does not, therefore, meet the objectives that the present invention was intended to achieve.

As Fritz fails to anticipate the invention as recited in claims 9 through 13, as amended, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

In light of this amendment, all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application are allowable. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to allow all pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard B. O'Planick – Reg. No. 29,096
Attorney for Applicants

The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company
Department 823
1144 East Market Street
Akron, Ohio 44316-0001
Telephone: (330) 796-5240
Facsimile: (330) 796-9018